



AF/DPW

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
BEFORE THE BOARD OF APPEALS

Appellant:	Marius HAURI et al.	)	
		)	
Serial No:	10/665,514	)	Art Unit: 3767
		)	
Filed:	September 22, 2003	)	Examiner: Witczak, Catherine
		)	
For:	SAFETY NEEDLE ASSEMBLY	)	Attorney Docket: 0100/0165
	AND METHOD FOR MAKING	)	
	THE SAME	)	

**SUBMISSION OF REPLACEMENT PAGE IN RESPONSE TO  
NOTIFICATION OF NON-COMPLIANT APPEAL BRIEF**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir

In response to the Notification of Non-Compliant Appeal Brief dated March 27, 2009, submitted herewith is a replacement Page 10 for the Appeal Brief filed on February 27, 2009 in which the typographical error "27" in Ground IV has been corrected to "24".

Please replace the non-compliant Page 10 with the hereto attached corrected Replacement Page 10 for the Appeal Brief.

Respectfully submitted,

Louis Woo, Reg. No. 31,730  
Law Offices of Louis Woo  
717 North Fayette Street  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314  
Phone: (703) 299-4090

Date: March 31, 2009



**GROUND OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL**

- I. Claims 1-2, 4, 9, 20-21, 23 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Crawford et al. (US 2002/0161336) in view of Hudon (US 7,156,825).
- II. Claims 8 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Crawford in view of Hudon and further in view of Landis (US 5,490,841).
- III. Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Crawford in view of Hudon and further in view of Gyure (US 5,669,889).
- IV. Claims 5 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Crawford in view of Hudon and further in view of Johnson et al. (US 2002/0010433).
- V. Claims 6 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Crawford in view of Hudon and further in view of Pressly, Sr. et al. (US 7,014,622).
- VI. Claims 11, 13-17 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson in view of Crawford and Hudon and further in view of Pressly.
- VII. Claim 18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson in view of Crawford, Hudon, Pressly and Landis.